



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Washington, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF
GENERAL COUNSEL

Ms. Melissa A. Hoffer
[REDACTED]

By email to: [REDACTED]

Dear Ms. Hoffer:

In anticipation of your joining the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as the Principal Deputy General Counsel on or about January 20, 2021, you have asked if you would be permitted to participate in making policy decisions regarding specific party matters in which the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is a party or intervenor. Based on your request and the information available to us, the EPA generated the enclosed list of cases.

Within the last year, you have served as the Chief of the Energy and Environment Bureau of the Office of the Massachusetts Attorney General. We understand that you participated personally and substantially in a number of these cases or supervised others who participated personally and substantially in these particular matters that involve Massachusetts as a specific party.

Upon your swearing in as a federal employee, you will have a "covered relationship" with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts pursuant to 5 C.F.R. § 2635.502(b)(iv) and, for one year, must be mindful to avoid an appearance of a loss of impartiality in the performance of your official EPA duties. You do not have any significant financial interest in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, so the Office of General Counsel does not determine that you had any conflicting financial interest. What remains is an impartiality concern.

Federal ethics regulations permit federal officials to participate in matters that might raise impartiality concerns when the interest of the federal government in the employee's participation outweighs concern over the questioning of the "integrity of the agency's programs and operations." 5 C.F.R. § 2635.502(d). These factors are:

- (1) the nature of the relationship involved;
- (2) the effect that resolution of the matter will have upon the financial interest of the person affected in the relationship;
- (3) the nature and importance of the employee's role in the matter, including the extent to which the employee is called upon to exercise discretion in the matter;
- (4) the sensitivity of the matter;
- (5) the difficulty of reassigning the matter to another employee; and

(6) adjustments that may be made in the employee's duties that would reduce or eliminate the likelihood that a reasonable person would question the employee's impartiality.

Since we have already determined that you have no substantial conflicting financial interest arising from your employment with Massachusetts, we turned to the six impartiality factors listed in 5 C.F.R. § 2635.502(d), taking each one into careful consideration.

We noted that your prior employment was with a State rather than a private entity. Generally, States share responsibility with EPA in protecting human health and the environment. In fact, with respect to many of our statutes, EPA has directly delegated regulatory and enforcement authority to states. That said, we also appreciate that, in some situations, States are directly regulated by this Agency.

We are mindful of the fact that the position description for the Principal Deputy General Counsel includes "First Assistant" duties for the General Counsel under the Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, 5 U.S.C. § 3345. We therefore considered the interests of the United States Government in a senior political appointee's ability to make policy decisions as to whether or not to continue to pursue current litigation, particularly at the onset of a new administration in the absence of a confirmed General Counsel or Administrator. Although we recognize that you face bar restrictions limiting your ability to participate in these cases substantively, we determined that your participation is not related to the underlying merits of any case but rather you would be making policy decisions only.

After careful consideration of the relevant factors, we conclude that the interest of the federal government outweighs any concerns about a loss of impartiality in your ability to participate in the enclosed list of particular matters that may affect or involve the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as a party and in which you may have participated personally and substantially. After joining the EPA as Principal Deputy General Counsel, you will be permitted to participate in discussions and meetings related to the policy decisions related to these cases. We remind you, however, not to participate in the merits of the cases nor to reveal any client confidences.

Please feel free to contact me or Jim Payne, Designated Agency Ethics Official, if you have any further questions. I can be reached at fugh.justina@epa.gov or (202) 564-1786; Jim can be reached at payne.jim@epa.gov or (202) 564-0212.

Sincerely yours,

Justina Fugh

Digitally signed by Justina
Fugh
Date: 2021.01.19
18:45 38 -05'00'

Justina Fugh

Director, Ethics Office and

Alternate Designated Agency Ethics Official

enclosure

LIST OF CASES IN WHICH MASSACHUSETTS IS A PARTY OR INTERVENOR
PENDING IN EPA'S OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL

Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Defendant Intervenor:

- *Wisconsin v. EPA*, D.C. Cir. 16-1406 - petition for review of EPA's Final Rule titled "Cross-State Air Pollution Rule Update for the 2008 Ozone NAAQS" 81 Fed. Reg. 74,504 (October 26, 2016)
- *Competitive Enterprise Institute v. EPA*, D.C. Cir. 20-1145 - petition to review "The Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient (SAFE) Vehicles Rule for Model Years 2021-2026 Passenger Cars and Light Trucks" Fed. Reg. 24174-25278 (April 30, 2020)
- *Murray Energy v. EPA*, 16-1127 D.C. Cir. - petition for review of EPA's final action entitled "Supplemental Finding that it is Appropriate and Necessary to Regulate Hazardous Air Pollutants from Coal- and Oil-Fired Electric Utility Steam Generating Units at 81 Fed. Reg. 24,420 (April 25, 2016)
- D.C. Cir. 16-1430 (defend EPA medium and heavy duty truck GHG standards)

Intervenor:

- *League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), et al. v. EPA*, 9th Cir. 17-71636 - Challenge to March 29, 2017 order denying PANNA/NRDC FFDCA petition
- *North Dakota v. EPA*, D.C. Cir. No.15-1381 - EGU GHG 111(b)

Petitioner

- D.C. Cir. 19-1230 (SAFE CA waiver)
- *New York et. al. v. Wheeler et. al.*, S.D.N.Y. 19-11673 - Challenge to the rule repealing the 2015 definition of "waters of the United States" under the CWA and reinstating the prior regulatory definition.
- *New York et. al. v. EPA*, D.C. Cir. 17-1273 - petition for review of EPA's final action titled "Response to the December 9, 2013, Clean Air Act Section 176A Petition From Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont," 82 Fed. Reg. 51,238 (November 3, 2017)
- *New York et. al. v. EPA*, D.D.C. 1:18-cv-00773 - for failure to establish guidelines for standards of performance for methane emissions from existing oil and gas operations
- *New York et. al. v. EPA*, D.C. Cir. 18-xxxx - petition for review of EPA's notice entitled "Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Notification of Guidance and a Stakeholder Meeting Concerning the Significant New Alternatives Policy (SNAP) Program," 83 Fed. Reg. 18,431 (April 27, 2018)
- *New York et. al. v. Wheeler et. al.*, 9th Cir. 19-71982 - Petition for review of "Chlorpyrifos; Final Order Denying Objections to March 2017 Petition Denial Order"
- *New York et. al. v. EPA*, D.C. Cir. 19-1165 - petition for review of EPA's final agency action entitled "Repeal of the Clean Power Plan; Emission Guidelines for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Existing Electric Utility Generating Units; Revisions to Emission Guidelines Implementing Regulations," published at 84 Fed. Reg. 32,520 (July 8, 2019)
- *New York et. al. v. EPA*, D.C. Cir 20-1437 - petition for review of EPA's final action titled "Accidental Release Prevention Requirements: Risk Management Programs Under the Clean Air Act; Final Actions on Petitions for Reconsideration" at 85 Fed. Reg. 55,286 (Sept. 4, 2020)
- *New York et. al. v. EPA*, S.D.N.Y. 1:21-cv-00252 - for failure to approve or disapprove Good Neighbor state implementation plans for the 2015 ozone NAAQS for 6 states (IN, KY, MI, OH, TX, WV)

- *New York et. al. v. EPA*, S.D.N.Y. 1:16-cv-07827 - Failure to Act on their Petitions Under Clean Air Act Section 176A
- *California et. al. v. EPA*, D.C. Cir. Case No. 21-XXXX – petition for review of final agency action entitled “Control of Air Pollution from Airplanes and Airplane Engines: GHG Emission Standards and Test Procedures,” published at 86 Fed. Reg. 2,136 (Jan. 11, 2021).
- *California et. al. v. Wheeler et. al.*, N.D. Cal. 3:20cv03005 – NWPR
- *California et. al. v. EPA*, N.D. Cal. 3:17-cv-06936; 4:17-cv-06936 - for Failure to Issue Designations for 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards
- *California et. al. v. EPA*, D.C. Cir. 20-1357 - Petition for review challenging the Oil & Gas Policy Rule: “Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review” 85 Fed. Reg. 57,018 (Sept. 14, 2020)
- *California et. al. v. EPA*, D.C. Cir. 21-1014 - petition for review of EPA's final action entitled “Review of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter,” published at 85 Fed. Reg. 82,684 (Dec. 18, 2020)
- *Commonwealth of Massachusetts et. al v. EPA*, 3:03-CV-984 D. Conn. - Failure to list CO2 as a criteria pollutant
- *Commonwealth of Massachusetts et. al v. EPA*, D.C. Cir. 20-1221 - Petition for Review of EPA’s National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Coal- and Oil-Fired Electric Utility Steam Generating Units—Reconsideration of Supplemental Finding and Residual Risk and Technology Review at 85 Fed. Reg. 31,286 (May 22, 2020) (aka MATS)
- *New Jersey et. al. v. EPA*, S.D.N.Y. 1:20-cv-01425 - for Failure to Perform Nondiscretionary Duty to Promulgate Federal Implementation Plans for the Good Neighbor Provision Requirements for the 2008 Ozone NAAQS
- *American Lung Association v EPA*, D.C. Cir No. 19-1440 – ACE litigation
- D.C. Cir. No. 20-1145
- N.D. Cal. No. 19-cv-03807 (TSCA asbestos reporting)
- Ninth Cir. No. 20-73276 (methylene chloride risk evaluation)
- N.D. Cal. No. 20-cv-04869 (limiting state authority re Section 401 water quality certifications)
- MA-led amicus in support of challenge to WOTUS, D-Mass 12/20 (do not have docket no.)

Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection

Defendant:

- *Alderson v. EPA et. al.*, 1:10-cv-10793 (appears dismissed but displayed as active?)
- *PSD Appeal No. 14-02*, E.A.B.- PSD permit issued by Massachusetts DEP
- *Brooks v. EPA et. al.*, 1st Cir. 14-2252, petition for review of Notice of Decision To Issue a Clean Air Act PSD Permit for Salem Harbor Redevelopment Project
- *Rauseo v. Army Corps of Engineers et. al.*, D. Mass. 1:17-cv-12026-NMG - Failure to exercise jurisdiction over filled wetlands

ADDITIONAL CASES:

Greenroots, Inc. and Conservation Law Foundation v. EPA, (District of Massachusetts, Case No. 1:21-cv-10065) (Mass is not a party but the case involves some complaints filed with ECRCO against Mass agencies.)

Intervenor, Newmont USA Limited v. EPA, No. 04-1069 (Challenge to 2002 NSR reform rule treatment of fugitive emissions)

Petitioner, State of New York v. EPA, No. 20-1022 (Challenge to 2019 RMP Rule) (consolidated under Air Alliance Houston v. EPA, No. 19-1260)